

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/629,072	07/28/2003	Chi Yung Fu	6146	
7590 02/27/2004			EXAMINER	
CHI YUNG FU			FRANK, RODNEY T	
1005 DUNCAN ST. SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94131			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		2856	
		DATE MAILED: 02/27/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/629,072	FU, CHI YUNG
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Rodney T. Frank	2856
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) o will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the special to become ABANDO	timely filed days will be considered timely. om the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u>_</u> ·	
,	s action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa closed in accordance with the practice under E		
Disposition of Claims		
 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 2-4 and 13-15 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	wn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Examine		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 28 July 2003 is/are: a)		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applic crity documents have been rece u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ation No ived in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail	
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/629,072 Page 2

Art Unit: 2856

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: In the first line of the specification, under the heading RELATED APPLICATIONS, at the end of the sentence, please add the following phrase: – now U.S. Patent Number 6,598,459.–.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

- 2. Claims 2-4 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. The limitations in claims 2-4 (i.e. the exact makeup of the surface increasing material) are already in the parent claim and therefore these claims add nothing new that independent claim 1 does not already disclose.
- 3. Claims 13-15 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. The limitations in claims 13-15 (i.e. the exact makeup of the surface increasing material) are already in the parent claim and therefore these claims add nothing new that independent claim 10 does not already disclose.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/629,072 Page 3

Art Unit: 2856

5. Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. These claims add nothing to the parent claim they are dependent from.

6. Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. These claims add nothing to the parent claim they are dependent from.

Double Patenting

7. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

- 8. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 1 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,598,459. This is a double patenting rejection.
- 9. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 2, 3, and 6 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,598,459. This is a double patenting rejection.
- 10. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 4 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,598,459. This is a double patenting rejection.
- 11. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 5 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,598,459. This is a double patenting rejection.

12. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 7 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,598,459. This is a double patenting rejection.

- 13. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 8 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,598,459. This is a double patenting rejection.
- 14. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 9 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,598,459. This is a double patenting rejection.
- 15. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 10 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,598,459. This is a double patenting rejection.
- 16. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 11 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,598,459. This is a double patenting rejection.
- 17. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 12-14 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,598,459. This is a double patenting rejection.
- 18. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 15 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,598,459. This is a double patenting rejection.
- 19. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 16 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,598,459. This is a double patenting rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rodney T. Frank whose telephone number is (571) 272-2193. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9am -5:30p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hezron E. Williams can be reached on (571) 272-2208. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/629,072

Art Unit: 2856

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Page 5

RTF February 5, 2004

HEZRON WILLIAMS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800